ESTTA Tracking number:

ESTTA411898 05/31/2011

Filing date:

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE BEFORE THE TRADEMARK TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

Proceeding	92053911
Party	Defendant Ovation, Inc.
Correspondence Address	OVATION INC 3810 BEDFORD AVE, SUITE 200 NASHVILLE, TN 37215 UNITED STATES
Submission	Answer
Filer's Name	Paige MIIIs
Filer's e-mail	pmillls@bassberry.com
Signature	/paige mills/
Date	05/31/2011
Attachments	o589339.pdf (6 pages)(16059 bytes)

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE TRADEMARK TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

Serial No.: 77/589339		
Mark: OVATION		
Published in the Official Gazette on March 2, 2010		
OVATION, LLC)	
Petitioner,)	
v.)	ANSWER Cancellation No. 92053911
OVATION, INC.)	92033911
Registrant.)))	
)	

ANSWER

Registrant, Ovation, Inc. ("Registrant") answers the Petition for Cancellation (the "Petition") of Ovation, LLC ("Petitioner"), as follows:

- 1. Registrant is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the allegations contained in Paragraph 1 of the Petition and, on that basis, denies generally and specifically each and all other allegations.
 - 2. Admitted.

In re the matter of Application

- 3. Admitted.
- 4. Denied.
- 5. Registrant is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the allegations contained in Paragraph 5 of the Petition and, on that basis, denies generally and specifically each and all other allegations.
 - 6. Denied.
- 7. Registrant admits that Patent and Trademark Office ("PTO") records reflect that Petitioner filed an application on the day in question, but Registrant denies that any inference can be drawn from the language in Petitioner's application. Registrant also states that Petitioner's application speaks for itself.
- 8. Registrant admits that PTO records reflect that Petitioner filed an application on the day in question, but Registrant denies that any inference can be drawn from the language in Petitioner's application. Registrant also states that Petitioner's application speaks for itself.
- 9. Registrant admits that the PTO records reflect that a Section 2(d) refusal was issued on Petitioner's marks. Registrant also states that the office action speaks for itself.
- 10. Registrant is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the allegations contained in Paragraph 10 of the Petition and, on that basis, denies generally and specifically each and all other allegations.
- 11. Registrant is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the allegations contained in Paragraph 11 of the Petition and, on that basis, denies generally and specifically each and all other allegations.
 - 12. Denied.

- 13. Denied.
- 14. Denied.
- 15. Denied.

Registrant denies that Petitioner is entitled to any relief, including the relief sought in the WHEREFORE clause of its Petition.

AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES

FIRST AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

16. Petitioner is not entitled to seek cancellation of Registrant's marks to the extent that such registrations contain goods and services other than "cable television broadcasting services." In short, the Petitioner's Petition cannot exceed the scope of its application.

SECOND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

17. The Petition fails to state a sufficient basis on which to cancel the registration of Registrant's mark and fails to state a claim upon which relief may be granted.

THIRD AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

18. The Petition is barred by the equitable doctrines of laches, acquiescence waiver and/or estoppel.

FOURTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

19. Upon information and belief, Petitioner has not continuously used its claimed marks for all goods and services named in the Petition since 1995.

FIFTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

20. Petitioner cannot establish nationwide use of its claimed marks prior to the filing date of Registrant's Mark.

SIXTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

21. Petitioner cannot establish use in commerce for the indicated goods and services that predates Registrant's use.

SEVENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

22. Registrant asserts that its existing registrations are valid, proper, and controlling of the parties' rights in this matter. In the alternative, should Petitioner be able to establish a date of first use that predates Registrant's date of first use, as the first to register, Registrant is entitled to maintain its nationwide rights created by its registration, subject only to the territory that Petitioner is able to establish existed at the time of Registrant's application.

Registrant reserves the right to add additional affirmative defenses and other claims as discovery develops.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Registrant contends the Petition is groundless and requests judgment denying the Petition and this proceeding in its entirety with prejudice.

DATED: May 31, 2011.

Respectfully submitted,

BASS, BERRY & SIMS PLC

By: /paige mills/_

Paige W. Mills Ryann Schneider Alison Grippo BASS, BERRY & SIMS PLC 315 Deaderick Street, Suite 2700 Nashville, Tennessee 37238-3001

Telephone: (615) 742-6200 Facsimile: (615) 742-0410

Attorney for Defendant, Ovation, Inc.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned hereby certifies that a true and complete copy of the foregoing Answer was served on Elise Tenen-Aoki by mailing said copy on May 31, 2011, by First-Class Mail, postage prepaid to:

Elise Tenen-Aoki Greenberg Traurig LLP 2450 Colorado Avenue, Suite 400E Santa Monica, CA 90405

DATED this 31 st day of May, 2011.	
	/paige mills/
9558340.1	